

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,095	12/01/2000	Dario de Judicibus	GB92000002US1	4536
5	7590 07/25/2003			
Derek S. Jennings IBM Corporation, I.P. Law Dept. T. J. Watson Research Center			EXAMINER	
			MAHMOUDI, HASSAN	
P.O. Box 218 Yorktown Heights, NY 10598			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	<b>5</b> ,		2175	
			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003	(

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*;	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/728,095	JUDICIBUS, DARIO DE				
-	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tony Mahmoudi	2175				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she t with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. $\square$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. Other:		DOV POPOVICI				
	S	UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100				

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 09/728,095

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments filed on 25-June-2003, with respect to the cited references have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive:

In response to the applicant's argument that "the claims are not obvious by the modification Knutson et al in view of Balabine et al", the argument has been addressed by the examiner in the "final rejection" office action, mailed out on 25-March-2003 (paper No. 4). See page 9 of the "final rejection" office action (paper No. 4.)

In response to the applicant's arguments that "Knutson et al does not teach the use of 'conditional attributes'" and that Knutson does not "teach or suggest the use of display attributes", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Knutson et al teaches 'condition attributes' as 'alerts' (see column 3, lines 32-33), and he teaches 'display attributes' as link lists' (see column 28, line 57 through column 29, line 5, where "display attribute" is read on "these linked lists are used to determine which objects to display to the user.)

In response to the applicant's argument that "Knutson does not teach or suggest the changing of any type of attribute into another" and that "further, Balabine does not teach or suggest applicant's claimed features as stated above", the arguments have been addressed by the examiner in the "final rejection" office action, mailed out on 25-March-2003 (paper No. 4). See page 10 of the "final rejection" office action (paper No. 4.)